TP ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

09-182

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Received & Inspected

FEB 2 6 2010

FCC Mail Room

MEDIA OWNERSHIP WORKSHOP

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, January 27, 2010

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
703) 510 7100 Feb. (703) 55

No. of Copies recultist ABCDE

Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190 www.andersonreporting.net

•		2
1	PARTICIPANTS:	
2	Chief, Media Bureau Federal Communications	
3		
4	MIGNON CLYBURN	
5	Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission	
6	ROBERT MCDOWELL Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission	
7	Minority Ownership Through the FCC's Media Ownership Rules	
8		
9	Moderator:	
10	JACOB LEWIS Acting Deputy General Counsel Federal Communications Commission	
11		
12	Panelists:	
13	LEONARD BAYNES Professor of Law	
14	Inaugural Director Center for Civil Rights	
15	CAROLYN BYERLY Associate Professor, Howard University	
16	ANGELA CAMPBELL	
17 i	Professor of Law Director, Institute for Public Representation	
18	Georgetown University	
	ALLEN HAMMOND	
19	Professor Law, Santa Clara University	
20	LAVONDA REED-HUFF Associate Professor of Law, Syracuse University	
21		
22		

		3
1	PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):	
2	Panel 2: How the FCC's Media Ownership Rules Affect Minority and Female Ownership	
3		
4	Moderator:	
5	THOMAS REED Director, Office of Communications Business	
6	Opportunities Federal Communications Commission	
7	Panelists:	
8	FAITH BAUTISTA Executive Director, Mabuhay Alliance	
9	DAVID HONIG	
10	Executive Director, Minority Media and Telecommunications Council	
11	MICHAEL V. ROBERTS Chairman and Chief Executive Officer	
12	The Roberts Broadcasting Companies	
13	SYLVIA STROBEL Interim President, American Women in Radio and	
14	Television	
15		
16	* * * *	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

PROCEEDINGS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

2 (9:07 a.m.)

MR. LAKE: Good morning, all. I want to welcome you to this workshop, which is another in our series in connection with our quadrennial review of our media ownership rules.

Today's workshop will focus on the intersection between our media ownership rules and our policies in favor of diversity of ownership in broadcast.

We have two distinguished panels today. But I'm delighted to say that we will start off with some welcoming remarks from Commissioner Clyburn.

COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Lake.

Good morning, everyone.

GROUP: Good mornings.

COMMISSIONER CLYBURN: Oh, wow. The

word got out. Thank you. I appreciate it.

We have issues of the utmost importance to examine this morning, so I'll be brief. I am

very, so very much, looking forward to the
presentations and discussions by these esteemed
panelists and some of the challenges we face to
increase the number of women and minority owners

5 in the broadcast industry.
6 The Commission h

The Commission has fought to improve the dismal state of minority and female ownership in this arena, only to see faint progress along the way. Despite all our efforts to date, we must do better. And nothing, nothing else will suffice.

As our first panel today will undoubtedly discuss, there are formidable roadblocks in our path to a diverse and truly vibrant media market. The legal landscape has only become more foreboding over time, leaving us with limited options to create an environment conducive to minority and female ownership.

But what I ask of today's panelists, as well as of my colleagues here at the Commission, is that we persevere in the face of this steep uphill climb. Our goal is far too essential for us to yield. Let's put our heads together in

order to create a record, or design regulations that convey to the courts what we so clearly see as a compelling government interest, and find innovative ways to narrowly tailor our rules to achieve our worthy ends.

My friends, there is no -- no -stricter scrutiny than how we view ourselves at
the end of every day. We are measured as public
servants by what we can deliver to the American
people. And I believe that if we are thoughtful,
thorough and collaborative in our work, we can
break through this unfortunate logjam that has
left our nation's promise unfulfilled.

I pledge to you my full support to all of you in this endeavor. And, if my office can be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Thank you, panelists, for sacrificing your time, and for your commitment and for the commitment of all of those in the audience to not think it robbery to be here today.

I look forward to working with you to

make a meaningful and a positive -- or significantly-- a lasting impact.

Thank you and good morning.

MR. LAKE: Thank you very much,

Commissioner Clyburn. Those thoughts will guide
us through the morning.

We have two very distinguished panels as parts of today's workshop. The first will be representatives of the academic community. And the second, broadcasters and media advocacy groups.

I would like to just point out that we're being live webcast and recorded. So I'll ask all the speakers to get close to their microphones so we have good reception.

And we will be taking questions, both from those who are present in person, and from those who are in the webcast audience.

I will now turn it over to Jake Lewis, who is our Acting Deputy General Counsel, who will moderate the first panel.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Bill. The first

panelist is Professor Leonard Baynes.

Leonard Baynes is a professor of law and the inaugural director of the Ronald H. Brown

Center for Civil Rights and Economic Development at St. John's University Law School. He teaches business organizations, communications law, regulated industries, and race and the law.

Professor Baynes received his B.S. from
New York University, and a J.D./MBA from Columbia
University. Amongst his many achievements, from
1997 to 2001, Professor Baynes was hired by then
FCC Chairman William Kennard to serve as a scholar
in residence at the FCC, where he was responsible
for access, opportunity and ownership issues.

Professor Baynes.

MR. BAYNES: Thank you so much for inviting me here on this very, very important topic. And I have PowerPoint slides which I plan to show if we can get them up and running.

And what I plan to do today are two things, in the time I have allotted. One is to sort of talk about, sort of-- a lot of people say,

well, the Internet, broadband, they cure all of these issues. And one of the things I think that we need to think about is the fact that -- well, that's one thing, is that broadband and Internet, one of the things you have to ask, is it the same market? Is it really a substitute for broadcast? That's one issue.

And the second thing I want to talk about is sort of the studies that we had worked on while I was here at the FCC, dealing with broadcast ownership and the FCC's passive complicity in terms of the discrimination in the market that took place.

So let me begin with the PowerPoint slides. So, under the antitrust analysis, one of the things you need to look for in terms of determining whether broadcast and Internet and broadband are the same market is whether it's sort of, can you substitute between them? Are there distinct customers or there distinct prices? Is there sensitivity to price changes, specialized vendors? And do we see them as different markets?

And when you look at sort of the viewing patterns and the listening patterns of people of color with respect to radio and TV, you see that, generally, it's different. And the other thing we have to look at is sort of access to Internet and broadband, and the fact that there still is a digital divide.

And so let's look at some of the data.

I'm trying to get to the next slide.

So the other thing about the broadband and Internet is that we have to think about the fact that it is not free, whereas broadcast TV tends to be. There's still a digital divide between African-Americans and Latinos. And as a source of information, many people go to the same affiliated sites of the major broadcast stations and cable stations.

If we look at this Pew, recent Pew study, it shows that there's been increasing usage of the Internet by all population groups, but we still see there's a disparity between African-Americans, Hispanics and whites. And we

see that not everybody is still using the

Internet. And this is Internet usage from every

location.

If you look at broadband usage in the home -- home broadband -- you see much more of a disparity. And you still see Hispanics, especially, being particularly underserved.

And so the question is, if we are going to say, well let's use the Internet and broadband to sort of cure all the problems and everybody has access to everything -- well, some people don't.

And a large percentage of people of color do not.

And so the question is, broadband, given the -- broadcast, given the fact that it's in 99 percent of individuals' homes, and Internet and broadband is still not, it's not a substitute.

This is another part of the Pew study, which shows that 55 percent of Americans are connected to the Internet wirelessly, 83 percent of the Americans have cell phones, and only 35 percent of cell phone users actually access the Internet through their cell phones.

1 So, in terms of remote devices, access 2 to Internet through -- not at your home, there's a still a disparity, and there's still under-usage, 3 4 and it's still not going to cure the problems with 5

respect to broadband--broadcast access to replace

6 it.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So this looks at sort of the -- where there is some sort of difference, where African-Americans and Latinos actually outperform whites. And this is sort of use of the Internet with respect to wireless access to get access to the Internet. So those African-Americans and Latinos that actually use the Internet wirelessly actually outperform whites with respect to access of data through remote devices.

The last election, there was all this conversation about the fact that the Internet had sort of changed everything, and there was all this participation, et cetera. The Pew study showed that there really was a lot of involvement in the population, but that the Internet basically you had to be affluent or well-educated, really, to

use it. That that's where the growth was. So that it reaffirmed a lot of the statistics that we have with respect to disengagement, or lack of use, by people of color as opposed to whites, in terms of comparison.

And when the Pew study looks at this, where the people of color were very much involved in offline communication, it was almost similar, if you look at blacks and whites in terms of the political participation. But when you look at online communication, you still see a disparity between blacks and whites. And the Latinos that they surveyed, it was too few in number to actually give a percentage.

For social media, such as Facebook, et cetera, what you find is that the Pew study said, yes, there's been a great increase in growth by those under 35, in terms of political participation, civic participation, et cetera. But what you find is that there's still a gap. It may be a closed gap -- between those who are affluent and educated and those who are not.

we see with respect to broadcasting is that broadcasting is really fairly ubiquitous. But what we have in terms of what is covered is that there is over-sensationalism, in terms of the coverage, focus on conflicts. They often don't cover the issues that really affect people's lives.

So I think the difference is that what

And I'm going to -- I see I'm -- let me skip to sort of the studies that we worked on.

So what we look at with respect to the studies that the FCC had conducted during the late '90s that were released in 2001, one of the important things, I think, to take note of is that even though we had comparative hearing process to distribute licenses, most licenses actually were distributed through Singleton process. Over 6,000 licenses were distributed through not a comparative hearing, where there was only one applicant. And only the comparative hearings had preferences, or enhanced consideration, for people of minority backgrounds.

And so that's important because what you find with the study-so, let me skip forward-- is that 74 percent of non-minority initial applicants never competed in a comparative hearing, whereas 35 percent of minority initial applicants never competed in comparative hearings.

So what this shows -- this is an important point -- is that non-minorities were more likely to get licenses through a Singleton process where there was no competition, where there was no affirmative action process. Whereas for minorities, that was less likely -- much less likely. So if you were a non-minority, the chances of getting a license were much greater because there was no competition.

And, in fact, what would happen is that even though you had minority enhancements, you'd have more people going after the initial minority applicant.

So as a result -- this was a study that we had conducted, showed that the minorities and non-minorities, even if you take all this into

account, basically had almost a similar rate of getting the license -- 45 percent, versus 44 percent. And what also happened is that you often had more minorities actually participating in the process through the comparative hearing process. The number of minorities actually increased. So, 3.7 on average versus 3.2 for non-minorities.

For minorities versus women versus non-minorities, you see also this increase with respect to the number of minorities and women in terms of the number of applicants.

And part of this was a way for non-minorities probably to game the comparative hearing process.

This is sort of other examples of this.

But when it came to actually who got the licenses, those applicants that actually were minority-owned really did no -- did really worse than those that had minority participation. Which showed that there were a lot of minority applicants that were probably being used as fronts.

The studies also show that, you know, in terms of loans, which are sort of the lifeblood in terms of getting the licenses, that there was capital market discrimination in terms of interest rate amounts, getting the loans themselves, et cetera. Minority borrowers paid higher interest rates, et cetera.

There was also advertising discrimination, in terms of "no urban, no Spanish" dictates. Minority discounts -- I saw Cathy Sandoval in the audience, who was working on that. I saw her somewhere -- hi, Cathy.

And so as a result, KPMG, which did the study, found that there was a lower overall probability of minorities actually getting a license, a winning license, than non-minorities -- even despite you had, the fact, that you had these minority enhancements during this process.

As a result, you know, one of the issues you have here is that you have to look at what the standard is for review. And one of the issues that you have in the Croson case is that if you

1 distribute licenses in an industry or a market 2 that might be discriminatory and you realize that 3 you're doing that, the FCC may be passively 4 complicit in that discrimination. And that's 5 something I think the FCC needs to take into 6 account. Because it's been many, many years 7 before the FCC has actually had minority-ownership 8 policies.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the question is -- and this is my final, I know I'm sort of running out of time -- but to sum it up, is that you're never going to have a perfect solution. The FCC really needs to just get off the dime. Because if they're looking for a silver bullet, we'll never really know, because the problem is that there have been no cases since Metro Broadcasting, which there's now a different standard of review. And we'll never know, until there's a case that's actually brought.

And so what I challenge the FCC to do is sort of think about creative ways to make sure that minorities actually are able to fully

1 participate in the broadcast industry. 2 Thank you. 3 MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Professor Baynes. 4 I see, Bill, that Commissioner McDowell is now 5 here in the room. So perhaps we can divert to 6 him. 7 MR. LAKE: Yes, welcome. We'd welcome 8 some remarks from you. 9 COMMISSIONER McDOWELL: Thanks so much. 10 Sorry for being late. Traffic, what can I say? For those of you who are natives, you know what 11 12 I'm talking about. It's awful. All right. I'll condense this, because 13 I hate interrupting, and I didn't want to disrupt. 14 15 So, first of all, I appreciate everyone being here today -- everyone else who was able to make it on 16 time. 17 So I really welcome everyone's thoughts 18 19 on what the Commission can do to promote 20 opportunities for minorities and women through our 21 media ownership rules, as well as any

ownership-related initiatives that you may be

22

exploring.

As many of you know, I've been an active supporter of the Commission's recent efforts to support new and existing minority broadcasters, including — I heard mentioned earlier — the ban on discrimination in advertising, the so-called "no urban, no Spanish" dictates, which is very, very key, I think, and relaxing certain attribution rules to encourage greater investment in licensees controlled by small businesses, small business— eligible entities, including those owned by women and people of color.

Throughout my time as a Commissioner,

I've called for a greater awareness of the

financial realities that face small enterprises

and new entrants -- of course, including

minorities and women. Changes in our ownership

rules alone, though, as I think as was already

said, won't achieve much if the intended

beneficiaries can't obtain the financing they need

to make their aspirations a reality. A very

important color in all of this equation is the

color green, of course.

Now, while the government cannot address all aspects of the situation, I favor taking action when we have a good legal and factual basis for doing so. So, for example, for some time now I've urged that the Commission offer active assistance to Congress in fashioning a legally sustainable tax certificate program to promote ownership of communications companies by economically disadvantaged businesses. And I'd like to get your reactions and advice on this concept in particular. And I've been calling for that for several years now.

Similarly, I wonder whether maybe some small, small silver lining in the current economic situation that we find our country in, but especially for broadcasters. So de-consolidation, as a result, seems to be the current trend among some of the largest station-group owners. And that actually may, in turn, offer up some new opportunities for small entities, and new entrants coming into the business for the first time.

So if the panelists today, and going forward, have any suggestions in that regard, I would be very, very interested in hearing them.

So let's make some really tasty lemonade, maybe, out of the economic lemons we've been handed here recently.

Finally, I know that this panel will take on the most critical component of any future effort to craft race-conscious ownership rules, the substantial hurdles that the Commission or any government agency faces, to satisfy the demands of the Due Process clause as set forth under the Supreme Court's Adarand decision.

So I'd like to say this over and over -whether it's in this context or another context,

I'd really like to be upheld in court. And so I
think it can actually be counterproductive to take
a step forward but only to be knocked back several
steps by the courts. So let's measure twice and
cut once, and make sure what we do actually might
be upheld on appeal. I think that's very, very
important.

-

•

So, in any case, I look forward to the dialogue as it progresses today and hereafter, and as it has been progressing over the years. And I know Rosemary Harold will be here -- my legal advisor for all things media will be here -- to monitor this panel in more depth, as I've got a very busy morning ahead of me, unfortunately.

But thank you all very, very much, and I will be monitoring everything you say in here with great interest.

Thank you again.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Commissioner

McDowell. Our next panelist is Carolyn Byerly.

Dr. Byerly is a member of the Department of

Journalism and Graduate Faculty Member, Mass

Communication and Mass Studies Program at Howard

University. She is also a cofounder and

participant in the Howard Media Group, a

collaboration among communications scholars

involved in applied research and other activities

that have the goals of expanding race and gender

equality in media industries.

She is the co-author, among other things, of Women in Media: a Critical Introduction, and the co-editor of Women in Media:

Welcome, Dr. Byerly.

International Perspectives.

MS. BYERLY:: : Good morning. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you this morning, especially since I seem to be the only non-attorney in the lineup here. I'm not quite sure how that happened, except my colleagues and I keep company at a lot of these kinds of events.

My training is in social science research. For two decades I've been concerned with examining the dynamic relationship of women in media -- sorry, women and people of color to the news and other media.

With me today are, or soon will be, I hope, in the audience, two of my colleagues, Reggie Miles, and Dr. Yong Jin Park. We are part of the Howard Media Group that our colleague down the table here mentioned. The remarks that I'll

share today represent our shared thinking.

We will leave it for our scholars today

-- the legal scholars -- to speak to the finer

points of the law as regards the policy. And what

I would like to do is try and map out some broader

social-science type themes that represent the kind

of research we believe needs to be done so that

the Commission has all of the facts that it needs

to consider women and minority ownership.

Media ownership in the United States today divides along the historic fault lines of gender and race. The low, single-digit ownership rates for women and people of color in broadcast say quite loudly that the nation is faced with both a women's rights and a civil rights crisis in policy. The seriousness of the situation must be understood within the context of a nation moving rapidly toward racial and ethnic plurality with nobody having a majority.

The media today do not, and cannot serve the public interest as long as this skewed media ownership pattern continues. And the situation